

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed on April 4, 2003. Claims 5-20 are pending in the present application.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagan et al. (U.S. Patent 5,618,045) and Baer (U.S. Patent 3,993,861). Responsive thereto, Applicant has incorporated the limitation of claim 13 into claims 5, 7, 9 and 11 and has canceled claim 13. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of such amendments and the arguments to follow.

Baer '861 teaches the basic concept of sensing digital data on a screen using a light-sensing device. Kagan et al. '045 discloses an interactive multiple-player game with infrared means for communication between players. Kagan et al., however, has nothing to do with a light sensing means having a digital decoding means and a display means for capturing images and transferring the same to a data receiver. Kagan et al. only teaches a display means, which is known in the art.

Both references teach very different concepts that are arguably individually related to the totality of the claimed invention. However, there is a clear disconnect between the teaching of each prior art reference and the claimed result. Yet, the Examiner asserts that it "would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the information decoding scheme of Baer, which can be used to apply electrical signals to external equipment (e.g. a CRT display)(Baer, col. 2, ll 33-37), to coordinate an

ad-hoc wireless gaming network of Kagan to facilitate game playing by multiple players (Kagan, col. 3, ll. 12-20)."

The Examiner is clearly employing improper hindsight in asserting that one skilled in the art would be motivated by Kagan et al. to provide a display screen on the light sensing means of Baer to "capture" or "transfer" moving images to the light sensing means display screen. One skilled in the art would have no reason or motivation to add a display to the Baer light sensing means because the Baer light sensing means has no function that is equivalent to the light sensing means of the present invention. Similarly, the Kagan et al. player terminals or devices fail to comprise any function that is similar to the light sensing means of Baer. Such Kagan et al. player devices merely exhibit two-way communications between other devices, and fail to exhibit the responsive sensing properties that are integral to the Baer light sensor.

Be this as it may, and to clearly and unequivocally distinguish the present invention over the prior art asserted by the Examiner, Applicant has incorporated the element of claim 13 into the independent claims 5, 7, 9 and 11. Accordingly, with respect to the totality of the claimed invention, there is a critical link between the light sensing means display and the means for displaying the moving image on said display, with the digital data generated and decoded from the digital data decoding means. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Kagan et al. with Baer to arrive at the claimed invention, as amended, because there is no critical link between the portable device display means of Kagan et al. and the light sensing and decoding properties of the light

sensors in Baer. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to meet his burden to support his rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The combination of Kagan et al. and Baer fail to teach or reasonably suggest a light sensing device having a display and means for capturing and/or transferring an encoded and broadcast image to the display of the light sensing means (refer in particular to pending claims 15, 17 and 20). The prior art only teaches the transmission of encoded data through a data broadcast system, with such data being represented by a certain portion of an image that has unique color or light properties, and a light sensing device, that is able to interpret the unique color or light properties of such certain portion of such image, is then capable of decoding such data and communicating the same to an entertainment system or the like. There is no discussion of the displays of Kagan et al. having a function similar to a light sensing device of Baer, i.e., having the ability to interpret a unique color or light property of a certain portion of an image on a screen and then decode data embedded in such color or light property. As such, one skilled in the art would fail to learn from the combination of Kagan et al. and Baer to arrive at the claimed device.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 5-12 and 14-20, consisting of independent claims 5, 7, 9 and 11 and the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly

solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,


Harris A. Wolin
Reg. No. 39,432

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-2585
PHONE: (212) 940-8800
FAX: (212) 940-8776
DOCKET NO.: SCE1 16.549 (100809-16122)